

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 3, 2003. Claims 1-19, 23-41, and 45 are presented for examination, of which Claims 1, 23, and 45 are in independent form. Claims 20-22 and 42-44 have been canceled, without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, and will not be discussed further. Claims 1, 3, 6, 23, 25, 26, 28, and 45 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention, and Claims 4, 5, 24, 26, 27, 32, and 33 have been amended as to matters of form. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

The Office Action states that the title of the invention is not descriptive. The title has been amended to read as follows:

--INFORMATION PROCESSING APPARATUS AND METHOD
CAPABLE OF PROCESSING DIFFERENT TYPES OF INFORMATION FROM A
PLURALITY OF INPUT UNITS--.

Applicants respectfully submit that the title, as amended, is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

A Claim To Priority and a certified copy of the priority document for this application were filed on March 31, 2000, as evidenced by a returned receipt postcard bearing the stamp of the Patent and Trademark Office, a copy of which is attached hereto. Applicants respectfully request acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the receipt of the certified copy.

Claims 1, 12-17, 23, 34-39, and 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,677,993 (*Ohga et al.*). Claims 2-11 and 24-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ohga et al.*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,292,767B1 (*Jackson et al.*), and Claims 18, 19, 40, and 41 were rejected

under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ohga et al.* in view of *Jackson et al.* as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,884,249 (*Namba et al.*).

As shown above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 23, and 45 in terms that more clearly define what they regard as their invention. Applicants submit that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 1 is an information processing apparatus. The apparatus includes a plurality of input means, storage means, sorting means, and input analyzing means. The plurality of input means input different types of information. The storage means stores information input from each of the plurality of input means with an input time thereof. The sorting means sorts, by the input time, at least two types of information stored in the storage means. The input analyzing means analyzes a sequence of the at least two types of information sorted by the sorting means.

Among the notable features of Claim 1 are storing information input from each of the plurality of input means with an input time thereof, sorting, by the input time, at least two types of information stored in the storage means, and analyzing a sequence of the at least two types of information sorted by the sorting means.

Ohga et al. relates to an information processing apparatus for producing an output of necessary information in response to information obtained from an input by a pointing input unit and a speech input unit. The inputted information from the pointing input unit and the speech input unit are integrated together by changing these information into character string information of the same kind. The information analyzing portion analyzes the converted character string information (column 4, lines 17-42). The input

analysis processing of *Ohga et al.* is performed independent of the input order of the information (column 10, lines 38-59). Nothing has been found in *Ohga et al.* that would teach or suggest storing information input from each of the plurality of input means with an input time thereof, sorting, by the input time, at least two types of information stored in the storage means, and analyzing a sequence of the at least two types of information sorted by the sorting means, as recited in Claim 1.

Neither *Jackson et al.*, nor *Namba et al.* is seen to overcome the deficiencies of *Ohga et al.*

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is clearly patentable over the cited prior art.

Independent Claims 23 and 45 are method and computer-readable storage medium claims, respectively, corresponding to apparatus Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200